

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are canceled, and claims 10-24 are added; as a result, claims 10-24 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-4, 6 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims are not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.75(f) which requires claims to be numbered in Arabic numerals. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims have been canceled. Therefore, Examiner's objections are no longer applicable.

Summary of Claim Amendments

1. The independent claim 1 which was rejected has been cancelled and has been rewritten as independent Claim 10. The applicant would like to respectfully submit that whereas Lanter (6,079,282) claims a device comprising a monocrystalline spring, Claim 10 claims an apparatus comprising a helical spring. Therefore, Claim 10 is not anticipated by Lanter (6,079,282) and is patently distinguishable over Lanter (6,079,282)
2. A new independent claim 11 has been written. A distinguishing limitation of Claim 11 is a spring assembly which deflects longitudinally in the direction of an applied force, and transversely to the direction of the applied force such that the transverse deflection does not touch any portion of the upper surface and the lower surface. The applicant respectfully submits that the said limitation of Claim 11 is neither anticipated or obvious over any of the prior cited art.
3. A new independent claim 24 has been written. A distinguishing limitation of Claim 24 use of a device comprising a spring assembly which deflects longitudinally in the direction of an applied force, and transversely to the direction of the applied force such that the transverse deflection does not touch any portion of the upper surface and the lower surface. The applicant respectfully submits that the said limitation of Claim 24 is neither anticipated nor is it obvious over any of the prior cited art.

'102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 9 were rejected under 35 USC ' 102(b) as being anticipated by Lanter (U.S. Patent No. 6,079,282). Applicant respectfully reserves the right to swear behind the Lanter reference at a later time.

The independent claim 1 which was rejected has been cancelled and has been rewritten as independent Claim 10. The applicant respectfully submits that whereas Lanter (6,079,282) claims a device comprising a monocrystalline spring, Claim 10 claims an apparatus comprising a helical spring. Therefore, Claim 10 is not anticipated by Lanter (6,079,282) and is patently distinguishable over Lanter (6,079,282). In addition, claim 2, 4, 5, and 9 have been canceled so this rejection is no longer applicable those claims.

' 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC ' 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanter (U.S. Patent No. 6,079,282) in view of Gray (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,694). Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC ' 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanter (U.S. Patent No. 6,079,282) in view of Todd (U.S. Patent No. 3,121,328). Applicant respectfully reserves the right to swear behind the Lanter, Gray, and Todd references at a later time. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is no longer applicable because Claims 3 and 8 have been canceled.

New Claims 10-24

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider new claims 10-24. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 10-24 are supported by the description, and are allowable because they include limitations not disclosed, discussed, and/or suggested in the prior art references.

A new independent claim 11 has been written. A distinguishing limitation of Claim 11 is a spring assembly which deflects longitudinally in the direction of an applied force, and transversely to the direction of the applied force such that the transverse deflection does not touch any portion of the upper surface and the lower surface. Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 11 is supported by the description, and is allowable because it includes limitations not disclosed, discussed, and/or suggested in the prior art references.

A new independent claim 24 has been written. A distinguishing limitation of Claim 24 use of a device comprising a spring assembly which deflects longitudinally in the direction of an applied force, and transversely to the direction of the applied force such that the transverse deflection does not touch any portion of the upper surface and the lower surface. Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 24 is supported by the description, and is allowable because it includes limitations not disclosed, discussed, and/or suggested in the prior art references.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (650-248-3196) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM DAVID DALLENBACH

By their Representatives,

Raj V. Abhyanker
C/O PortfolioliP
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone Number 650-248-3196

Date

10/25/05

By



Raj V. Abhyanker
Reg. No. 45,474

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 26 day of October, 2005.

Chris Hammond

Name

Chris Hammond

Signature